REMARKS

Reconsideration of the subject application is respectfully requested. Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Mark Watson and Tatsuya Hosoda during their personal interview of April 19, 2007.

In the foregoing discussion, applicants will refer to the publication of the subject application, U.S. 2004/0056903, in order to allow easy reference by the Examiner to paragraph numbers.

Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the Examiner was under the impression that the possible embodiments of a machine-readable medium, as discussed in the specification, included an electromagnetic carrier signal including an infrared signal. The claims have been amended to change "machine" to "computer." As discussed with the Examiner, the computer-readable media is defined in the specification at paragraph [0299], which only lists tangible media examples, such as magnetic disks, CD-ROM, etc. The reference in the specification to "electromagnetic carrier signal including an infrared signal" is in paragraph [0305], which relates to communication controller 5124 rather than the computer-readable media. Thus, it is respectfully requested that this ground of rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-15 were rejected over combinations of Takai (US 5,874,965), Rogers (US 6,133,914), and Kannenberg (US 6,133,914). These rejections are respectfully traversed especially in view of the forgoing amendments. Claims 1, 3, 8, and 13-15 have been cancelled. Claims 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12 have been amended. Claims 16-21 have been added.

Independent claim 2 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 3, and further amended to recite "the process for sequentially displaying multiple objects displays one object after another in chronological order." This feature can be seen in Fig. 7 (navigation buttons 701) and described in paragraphs [0166-0167], for example: "multiple objects for which the file management parameter (further described below) is set to the same value can be displayed in sequence based on the relative magnitude of the value of the time line parameter. If a time line parameter is used, the relative value of the time line parameter determines the chronological order of the listing." It is respectfully submitted that this feature is neither shown

nor suggested in the prior art. Claims 4 and 5 are dependent on Claim 2 and are patentable for at least the same reasons. New Claim 16 is an apparatus (means-plus-function) version of Claim 2 and is patentable for the same reasons. New Claim 17 is a method version of Claim 2 and is patentable for the same reasons.

Independent claim 6 has been amended to include the limitations of original Claims 7 and 8, and further amended to recite "displaying multiple linked objects as a <u>group icon</u> by connecting each icon of the objects by using a <u>visual link to join icons into a group icon</u>; receiving an open command for the multiple objects displayed as a <u>group icon</u>; and opening and displaying the multiple objects based on the open command, wherein each of the multiple objects are <u>opened and displayed by a respective application that created the object</u>." This feature of a visual link is shown for example in Fig. 43 (linked by line 4301), and paragraph [0246], for example: "icons representing the linked objects are displayed with a visual link joining the icons into a group icon." The feature of receiving an open command for the multiple objects displayed as a <u>group icon</u>; and opening and displaying the multiple objects based on the open command, wherein each of the multiple objects are <u>opened and displayed by a respective application that created the object</u> is shown for example in Fig. 44, and described in paragraphs [0248-0249], for example "When a group icon is opened the multiple linked files are simultaneously opened as shown in Fig. 44. In other words, when a command to open the multiple objects displayed with a single group icon is received, the multiple objects are opened and presented based on this single command. In this example files created with different applications are opened at the same time by asserting an open command to each of the respective applications." It is respectfully submitted that these features are neither shown nor suggested in the prior art. Claim 7 is dependent on Claim 6 and is patentable for at least the same reasons. New Claim 18 is an apparatus (means-plus-function) version of Claim 6 and is patentable for the same reasons. New Claim 19 is a method version of Claim 6 and is patentable for the same reasons.

Independent claim 9 has been amended to include the limitations of original Claim 10, and further amended to recite "a process <u>for a user to define a relationship between multiple objects</u> associated with a particular cell of the directory matrix, wherein the process for defining a relationship between multiple

objects <u>includes displaying a visual expression of the relationship using specific attributes</u>. This feature can be seen in Fig. 64 and described in paragraphs [0282-0284], for example: "the <u>relationships between objects can be set by the user for each object or group of objects using templates</u> and these relationships can be stored with a specific attribute representing the relationship. <u>Object relationships can then be displayed with an intuitively understandable graphical representation</u> as shown in Fig. 64." Amended dependent Claim 11 recites coloring or arrows as specific attributes. See, for example paragraph [0282], "the relationship between objects (files) can be expressed using specific attributes such as coloring or arrows. These attributes can also make it easier to visually grasp the progress of a project (branching, integration, references, influences, etc.)." It is respectfully submitted that these features are neither shown nor suggested in the prior art. Claims 10 and 12 are dependent on Claim 9 and are patentable for at least the same reasons. New Claim 20 is an apparatus (means-plus-function) version of Claim 9 and is patentable for the same reasons. New Claim 21 is a method version of Claim 9 and is patentable for the same reasons.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark P. Watson/
Mark P. Watson
Registration No. 31,448

Please address all correspondence to:

Epson Research and Development, Inc.
Intellectual Property Department
2580 Orchard Parkway, Suite 225
San Jose, CA 95131
Phone: (408) 952-6124
Facsimile: (408) 954-9058
Customer No. 20178

Date: April 27, 2007